

## SLIPPERY SLOPE

The following quotes note that growing emphasis, anecdotally bearing witness to the fact that both **Schaeffer** and other evangelicals began to see the link between abortion and **euthanasia** more and more inseparably related

"The door is open. In regard to the fetus, the courts have separated 'aliveness' from 'personhood,' and if this is so, why not do the same with the aged? So the steps move along, and **euthanasia** may become increasingly acceptable."

"... If there are no absolutes by which to judge society, then society is absolute. Society is left with one man or an elite filling the vacuum left by the loss of the Christian consensus which originally gave us form and freedom in Northern Europe and in the West ... Absolutes can be this today and that tomorrow...Arbitrary absolutes can be handed down and there is not absolute by which to judge them."

"Our own generation can thus disregard human life. On the one end we kill the embryo through abortion and on the other end we will introduce **euthanasia** for the old. The one is already here and the door is opened for the other."

A few years later, **Schaeffer** went on to develop these thoughts with C. Everett Koop in *The Christian Manifesto*. His final published work, *The Great Evangelical Disaster* continued to demonstrate his conviction that abortion and **euthanasia** were ethical siblings.

In 1984, **Schaeffer** warned evangelicals: "And if one thinks of human life as basically no different from animal life, why not treat people the same way? It would only be religious nostalgia to do otherwise. And so it first becomes easy to kill children in the womb, and then if one does not like the way they turn out, to kill the children after they are born. And then it goes on to the **euthanasia** of anyone who becomes a burden or inconvenience. After all, according to the secular world view, human life is not intrinsically different from animal life - so why should it be treated differently."

In 1983, he said, "Protecting from one end of the age spectrum to the other, we see **euthanasia** for the elderly as the counterpart to abortion for the very young. There is no moral distinction between the two. Quality-of-life proponent Joseph Fletcher agrees: 'To speak of living and dying, therefore ... encompasses the abortion issue along with the **euthanasia** issue. They are ethically inseparable.' Those who take comfort in the fact that **euthanasia** is not practiced at present in America are leaning on a slim reed. Infanticide is **euthanasia** for newborn children..."

"If human life can be taken before birth, there is no logical reason why it cannot be taken after birth. Thus the quality of life, arbitrarily judged by fallible and sinful people, becomes the standard for killing or not killing human life - whether unborn, newly born, the rich, or the aged. But what then does this say about the handicapped now alive? Isn't their life wrongly and tragically de-valued? There are people who will read this book who would be allowed to die under these criteria if they were born today. The question of human life truly is a water-shed issue."

**Sources:** **Schaeffer, Francis**, *How Should We Then Live*, Crossway, 1976,;  
**Schaeffer, Francis**, *The Great Evangelical Disaster*, Crossway, 1984,

Peter Singer, who recently was seated in an endowed chair at Princeton's Center for Human Values, said, "Killing a disabled infant is not morally equivalent to killing a person. Very often it is not wrong at all."

In May 1973, James D. Watson, the Nobel Prize laureate who discovered the double helix of DNA, granted an interview to Prism magazine, then a publication of the American Medical Association. Time later reported the interview to the general public, quoting Watson as having said, "If a child were not declared alive until three days after birth, then all parents could be allowed the choice only a few are given under the present system. The doctor could allow the child to die if the parents so choose and save a lot of misery and suffering. I believe this view is the only rational, compassionate attitude to have."

In January 1978, Francis Crick, also a Nobel laureate, was quoted in the *Pacific News Service* as saying "... no newborn infant should be declared human until it has passed certain tests regarding its genetic endowment and that if it fails these tests it forfeits the right to live."

At a population-control conference in Washington D.C. one speaker saw "no reason why anyone who accepted abortion should balk at infanticide."

Consider the following scenarios:

A 70-year old retired man needs cataract surgery. This is going to cost the bureaucracy \$2,000 for some guy who wants to see, but doesn't make any money. No surgery. (Medicare has already advocated allowing people to go virtually blind before we fix their cataracts.)

A 60-year old grandmother who doesn't generate any income needs dialysis because of kidney failure. That's going to cost thousands. Forget it.

A 50-year old man who makes \$25,000 a year needs bypass surgery because of his chest pain. This guy may pay \$3,000 a year in taxes; his surgery is going to cost \$40,000. His ledger sheet doesn't balance. No surgery.

A baby is born with a handicap that's going to require frequent doctor visits, physical therapy, and multiple medications. What a drain on the system. Deny the baby adequate health care and let him die.

"The moral question for us is not whether the suffering and dying are persons but whether we are the kind of persons who will care for them without doubting their worth." C. Everett Koop

Source: <http://www.jeremiahproject.com/culture/life3.html>



**2005, Gateway Pregnancy Center**